

Town of Wellesley
Community Preservation Committee
Minutes-January 27, 2010

The Community Preservation Committee met in The Kingsbury Room at the Wellesley Police Station on January 27, 2010.

Present were the following CPC members: Jack Morgan (Chair), Tony Parker (Vice Chair), Rose Mary Donahue, Allan Port, Stephen Murphy, and Jim Conlin. Susan Minio, CPC administrative assistant was also present. Absent were Kara Cicchetti was absent. Joan Gaughan joined the meeting in progress.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.
No citizens chose to speak.

Tony Parker made a motion to approve the minutes for December 9, 2009 and December 16, 2009. Rose Mary Donahue seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Discussion about the possible surcharge increase:

Given current Town activities Jack Morgan wondered whether the CPC should go forward with a motion to consider raising the surcharge for CPC funding at this year's Annual Town Meeting (ATM). Allen Port stated that the CPC has not received strong support for the motion but if Senate Bill 90 should pass people may be receptive to supporting this request. Rose Mary Donahue supports this view. It was also noted that if the CPC does not go forward with the surcharge they should continue to have discussions around some of the larger projects that may come before the CPC for funding including full funding requests from Fuller Brook and the possible St. James location for fields. Stephen Murphy believes that by putting the Article on the warrant, the Committee put the issue on the table even if today is not the right time to go forward with a motion to increase surcharge. The Chair expressed the opinion that the CPC should work on a vision of the role of the CPC in Wellesley. Allen Port made the motion that we not advance any motion under Article 22. The motion was carried unanimously.

The Chair proposed that on the 10th the CPC officially revote the five recommendations that were made at the end of 2009. The CPC had a general discussion around Fuller Brook in preparation for the NRC presentation on the project to follow. At 8 PM on February 10th CPC will then present all of the approved projects (with the exception of the Fuller Brook Project) to Advisory in preparation for ATM.

Joan Gaughan joined the meeting along with members of the Fuller Brook Coordinating Committee.

Presentation from the Fuller Brook Park Coordinating Committee on the Fuller Brook Project

In attendance from the NRC: Janet Bowser, Director of the NRC, Neal Seaborn, Chair of NRC, Heidi Gross, Paul Cramer, Rick Bashian, Joan Gaughan, and Ursula King, running unopposed for the NRC in March. In attendance on behalf of the Fuller Brook Coordinating Committee (in addition to Mr. Seaborn, Ms. Gross and Ms. Bowser) were Gig Babson, Selectman, Bill Charlton, BPW, and Peter Fergusson, Historic

Commission. Rosemary Donahue, CPC, is also a member of the Coordinating Committee. Two members, Suzy Newman from the School Committee and Herb Nolan, an abutter, were absent. The Committee circulated a revised application that Jack Morgan received by email.

Janet Bowser presented the revised plan which has the project broken into phases.

The Chair requested we focus on the project in terms of the flow and general scope of Phase 1.

Ms. Bowser presented the three main components of the plan and noted that there would be 3-4 public meetings as well as likely additional special meetings with the abutters to discuss each part of Phase 1. The planned outcome at the close of Phase 1 would be a preferred alternative based on an advanced understanding of needs going into final design, a relatively firm estimate of the full cost, as well as an understanding from DPW regarding maintenance issues and costs.

There was a short discussion surrounding the role and need for a project manager. It was understood that the Coordinating Committee would vet the RFP and would interview and select the candidate. Rose Mary Donahue noted that the Project Manager role was necessary. In addition, she believes that the DPW should play a very strong role in the project and that their involvement is critical.

There was discussion of the timing and process leading up to requests for further funding at future Town Meetings.

Peter Fergusson, Historic Commission, stated that as a member of the committee he needs to look at the opportunity presented and evaluate the opportunities of how the Park should look in 2010 and beyond, while remaining clear on its historical significance. The Chair agreed and noted that it will be important to come up with a vision for the park and a first-rate plan and then sort through what the cost is and what is or isn't eligible for what kind of funding.

Katherine L. Babson, Selectman, added that the process needs to be very public. The funding issue is the last issue to be resolved.

Tony Parker asked for clarification on the funding numbers presented in the application. Ms. Bowser noted that Heidi Gross, Herb Nolan (abutter) and Chris Green (consultant) have provided strong numbers based on their professional knowledge. She is confident that the numbers are strong. Tony Parker also wanted to understand the hours on the part of the Project Manager. Per Ms. Bowser, the amount in the plan covers Phase 1 – which is 2 years. The job would be a manager with a firm's support and would average \$20,000 per year. Tony Parker's third question was around the role of the DPW. He wanted confirmation that the DPW will coordinate their needed work on the existing infrastructure with the development of the park. Mr. Bill Charlton, DPW, said that while there was no conclusive answer for this question yet, there was an obvious need for coordination. It is noted that the CPC would like to see the plan having that coordinated so that the infrastructure work is done at the same time.

Stephen Murphy wanted to have a further discussion around the conceptual vs. schematic final design decision. What is the amount split for this? Herb Nolan can provide firm numbers on this at a later date. Heidi Gross noted that the conceptual design will be the more expensive of the two.

Ms. Babson asked what the advantage was to going to a schematic design rather than getting a conceptual design and then moving forward after presenting the concept ATM. Ms. Gross described the

difference between conceptual and schematic and suggested that it is possible to get a good park without taking Phase 1 through schematic. However, she noted that going further would provide a better understanding of what the DPW would be agreeing to maintain and coordinate their infrastructure work.

The Chair asked the Committee if having some funding between the ATM and the start of the next fiscal year would help get the project moving. There was a brief discussion on options and possibilities to get the surveying of the land started.

It was agreed that the Fuller Brook Park Coordinating Committee would meet and decide the following open issues before the February 10th meeting that the CPC has with Advisory:

- 1) What administrative funds would the Committee need to get some of the project started early?
- 2) What is the agreed specific role of the Coordinating Committee?
- 3) When will Phase 1 conclude and what will be brought forward to the next ATM to show progress and request funding to take the project into Phase 2?

The NRC did want the CPC to consider presenting the new project under the CPC warrant article rather than as a stand-alone NRC motion. The Chair agreed to discuss this further with the CPC and share that decision shortly.

The meeting adjourned at 9:27 upon a motion by Stephen Murphy that was seconded by Allen Port.

The next CPC meeting will be held on February 10th in the NRC meeting room followed by a presentation to Advisory.